973
731 2.11.
8
K

AN ADDRESS

TO THE

Rev^d. Dr. HUDDESFORD,

Vice-Chancellor of OXFORD,

Occasioned by what is called,

His PROPER REPLY

TO

The Defence of the Rector and Fellows of EXETER-COLLEGE, *&c.*

LONDON:
Printed for R. GRIFFITHS, in Pater-Noster-Row. MDCCLV.

(Price Six Pence)

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

AN ADDRESS, &c

Mr. VICE-CHANCELLOR,

SIR,

YOU have at laſt condeſcended, after mature Deliberation, 'tis preſumed, to take ſome Notice of the *Defence of the Rector and Fellows of Exeter-College, &c.* As you have paid it this Compliment, after it had been induſtriouſly given out, that it was beneath your Dignity to take any notice of it, it will no doubt be expected that, in point of Civility at leaſt, it ſhould be acknowledged a Favour, that you have thought it worth while to pay any Regard to it at all.—Be this Favour acknowledg'd accordingly. At the ſame time the Publick will be ſtill farther convinc'd of the hard Meaſures *Exeter-College* has

met with, both from the Extracts of your Speech you have now publiſhed, and from the little you have advanced in Juſtification of the Treatment complain'd of. From whence, and from what will be ſaid in this Addreſs, it will alſo be ſeen with what *Propriety* you have given your Pamphlet the Title of a PROPER REPLY.

Be it acknowledged in the next Place, that, in your manner of Replying, you need be in no pain of having deſcended below your Dignity. You write, Sir, with full Dignity indeed; *Satis pro imperio* it muſt be allow'd; that is, with ſuch a ſovereign Contempt both of your Argument and your Adverſary, that you ſeem yourſelf to be a little apprehenſive of betraying *too great a Senſibility of your Station.* However, you proceed with a becoming Magnificence, that *for a Perſon in your Station to be ſummoned to the Bar of the Publick to anſwer for an academical Cenſure, is without Precedent.*—In the ſame Regal Stile do you declare, *you hold yourſelf not accountable for ſuch Reproofs, as in the Courſe of your Adminiſtration, you ſhall think it neceſſary to beſtow, &c.*—That *it is unbecoming the Office you have the Honour to ſuſtain to deſcend into perſonal Altercations, &c.*—That *you eſteem yourſelf to have proper Cognizance, &c.*—That *you ſhall not argue your Right,* &c;—Of all which the Publick are autho-

authoritatively bid to be *aſſured*, without any farther apology. Inveſted with theſe high Prerogatives, conſiſtently enough do you talk, tho' in a new ſort of Language, when you call *the Defence of Exeter-College* an ATTACK *upon the Vice-Chancellor*. And thus it is, the Complainants and Sufferers are made *Delinquents* of courſe, notwithſtanding their *Delinquency* is ſo far from being proved, that you yourſelf have long ago acquitted them of any Violation of the Univerſity-Statutes (*ſee Def.* p. 18.). By the ſame Authority, the *Appellants* in this Cauſe, by a ſtange Inverſion of Terms, are become the ASSAILANTS, your *rude Aſſailants*, for preſuming to vindicate the Fame and Honour of an injured Society, from the cruel Aſperſions, and more cruel Inſinuations, of a deſpotic Magiſtrate.

So much for your introductory Aſſumptions. We proceed now to thoſe Particulars *in the Exeter-College Defence*, with which you ſeem to be moſt alarm'd. For although you call your Paper a *Proper Reply*, &c. yet there are but two Points in that whole *Defence*, of which you have taken any particular notice; and theſe are, the connecting an Article in the *London-Evening Poſt* with your ſpeech in the Convocation; and a Charge of Diſloyalty, which you groundleſsly imagine has been brought againſt you.

Theſe you produce as a Specimen of that Miſ-repreſentation which abounds in all parts of their Performance. Let theſe Points be conſider'd. From thence it will appear, that Miſrepreſentation, with regard to both theſe Particulars, is chargeable not on the *Defender* of *Exeter-College*, but on the *Replier*. What you have alledg'd on the firſt Point ſhall be repreſented in your own Words.—" The writers of the Pamphlet " referr'd to have been guilty of groſs " Prevarication, in connecting the *Vice-* " *Chancellor*'s Speech with a Paragraph in a " *London* News-Paper, of which they have " the EFFRONTERY to treat him as the " Author. He has therefore been per- " ſwaded to ſtate to the Publick, how far " his Animadverſion did really extend, by " printing ſo much of his Speech as was " relative to the Matter complain'd of, or " could any way be ſuppoſed to concern " *Exeter-College* in particular, or any of its " Members.—He likewiſe begs leave to " aſſure any Gentleman of Candor, that " he has not ſo far forgot the Character " of a Magiſtrate, or a Clergyman, as to " ſtoop to the unſuitable Employment of " becoming a writer of Invective in any " News-Paper: And he does in particular " diſown any knowledge of the Writer, " or any Concern, directly or indirectly,

" in

" in the Publiſhing of the Paragraph re-
" ferr'd to by the ſaid Pamphlet."

As you have thought it conducive to your purpoſe to conceal from your Readers both the Paragraph publiſhed in the *London-Evening Poſt* and the ſeveral particulars of the Defender's Obſervations upon it, this artful Deficiency muſt be ſupply'd, in order to ſtate this whole matter more juſtly.

The News-writer ſets forth, that the *Vice-Chancellor*, in his ſpeech to the Convocation, *was led to animadvert with a becoming zeal and ſeverity, on the infamous Behaviour of ONE-COLLEGE, which in deſpight of all Decency open'd its Gates and its Cellars to the Refuſe of Mankind, and proſtituted itſelf, during the whole Poll, to be the ſhop of* CORRUPTION, *and the Factory of* PERJURY. The Defender had obſerv'd, that, " tho' " the College could not obtain from the " *Vice-Chancellor*, what they ſo earneſtly " requeſted, a Copy of the Charge brought " againſt them, yet they had been ſupply'd " in ſome Meaſure by another way. For " within two Days (after the Conference " held with the *Vice-Chancellor*, *October* 9.) " a farther account of the *Vice-Chancellor's* " Speech having been ſent to *London* was " printed, and came down in the *London-* " *Evening Poſt*, and was afterwards repeat- " ed in *Jackſon's Oxford Journal* of Octo-

" ber

ber 12."—The Defender having recited the whole article of this News, thus proceeds; "I make no apology for *ſuppoſing* the Vice-"Chancellor to be the author of this Arti-"cle, *i. e.* that he either ſent it himſelf to "the *London Evening Poſt*, or gave Direc-"tions to others to do it. At leaſt he ſtands "accountable for it as a Conſequence of the "Abuſes he had thrown out in his Speech; "in which it is evident he was underſtood "by his Hearers as ſaying ſo much, and that "he has ever ſince acquieſced in the Im-"putation; or otherwiſe he could not fail "to have contradicted it, and to have re-"monſtrated againſt this injurious Article, "eſpecially when republiſhed in the *Ox-"ford* Paper."

If the impartial Reader ſhould not immediately, upon viewing this ſtate of the Caſe, diſcern the Unreaſonableneſs of your Complaint on this Head, He muſt be intreated to give a proper attention to the following Particulars.

Firſt, the Defender of *Exeter College* does not charge it peremptorily on the Vice-Chancellor, that he was the Author of the Article referred to, but only *ſuppoſes* him to be the author. And is there no difference between a peremptory Charge, and a Suppoſition grounded on probable Appearances,

—on Appearances probable, at leaſt, at the time when the Suppoſition was made? You have indeed alledg'd ſomewhat, which you may flatter yourſelf contradicts ſuch appearances, *viz.* " That you have not ſo far " forgot the Character of a Magiſtrate, or a " Clergyman, as to ſtoop to the unſuitable " Employment, of becoming a Writer of " Invective in any News-Paper."——— This, Sir, is now ſaid: but what reaſon had the Defender to preſume this at a time, when you had ſo far forgot your Character in both theſe Reſpects, as to deal forth Defamation in the Convocation-Houſe, *ex Cathedrâ*, againſt a ſociety over which you had no Juriſdiction, in a matter which did not belong to your Cogniſance,——— upon Grounds entirely inſufficient,—againſt the Univerſity-Statutes you had ſworn to obſerve—and with the very Book of Statutes at that time lying before you, as one of the Enſigns of your Authority? Now, a Magiſtrate and Clergyman, capable of doing this, might well be ſuppoſed as capable of carrying this Defamation ſtill farther, by publiſhing it abroad, and ſpreading the Scandal over the Kingdom, thro' the Conveyance of a ſeditious News-Paper. You have now, indeed, diſowned any Knowledge of the Writer, or any Concern directly or indirectly in publiſhing the aforementioned Paragraph.

graph. But, be this as it will, whatever credit or diſcredit be given to your preſent Denial, yet the Point in Queſtion is properly this; what were the appearances of things at the time when the *Defence* was publiſhed? and if theſe did, at that time, make it probable that you had ſome Concern, directly or indirectly, in publiſhing that Paragraph, then the Defender is juſtified in the Suppoſition by him made.—To this Purpoſe, you are called upon, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, to recollect, that when the Rector, in the cloſe of the Conference held with you *Oct.* 9, ſaid, —" Well, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, you will " not be pleaſed to gratify us with a Copy " of the Charges brought againſt us in your " Speech," your Reply was this,— " *No*, " *Sir, at leaſt not yet.*" Did not this intimate your Intention of doing it at ſome other time, at your own time, and when you yourſelf ſhould judge proper? Why truly, within two days after this, the notable Paragraph in the *London Evening Poſt* appear'd. Now was it not natural to ſuppoſe, that the Publication of this Paragraph was a beginning to fulfil this Intention? That it was at leaſt deſigned to explain how far your Charge did really extend, and therefore that you had ſome Concern in the Publication of it? for tho' you might not chuſe to gratify your Petitioners in their Requeſt,

you

you might think it highly expedient to let the World ſee what you had thought and ſaid of them.—

To this may be added, that the Subject-matter of this Paragraph gave a farther countenance to the Defender's Suppoſition; for the greateſt part of it anſwered exactly to what the injured Perſons had perfectly recollected of your Speech, only in one Particular they were leſs confident, *viz*, whether you had not charged them with the having encouraged Perjury? Upon this Head you had given ſome ſlight anſwer in the abovementioned Conference, intimating that what related to Perjury belonged to ſome other Part of the Speech. But the News-Paper explained it; and, under theſe Circumſtances, to whom could the Explanation be more properly referr'd, than to the Author of the Charge ſo explained? Be it ſtill remembered that what is here alledged is not brought as a Demonſtration of the *Vice-Chancellor*'s being the Writer of this Paragraph. The Defender of *Exeter-College* has not aſſerted, but ſuppoſed him to be ſo: And this ſuppoſition however probable it appeared, he has not conſidered as the only Ground of making him accountable for it. For

He proceeds, *Secondly*, in this manner: "At leaſt he (*i. e.* the *Vice-Chancellor*) ſtands

" accountable for it, as a Conſequence of " the Abuſes he had thrown out in his " Speech; in which it is evident he was " underſtood by his Hearers as ſaying ſo " much." And ſurely, Sir, you are not to learn at this time, that he who does a bad Action is anſwerable for its Conſequences, as well as for the Action itſelf, and for that reaſon to be treated as the Author? Beſides, the matter now before us is ſo circumſtanced, that tho' you ſhould not have concern'd yourſelf either directly or indirectly in publiſhing this Paragraph, ſtill the Hearers of the Speech, from whom the *London-Evening Poſt* derived the Information, muſt have underſtood you as ſaying what the News-Writer has delivered. For a Proof of which, we need only appeal to one of your own Defenders, who, tho' under the fictitious Title of a *Cambridge-Soph*, is generally underſtood to be a Member of the Convocation Houſe in *Oxford*, and one that was preſent at the ſpeaking of the Speech. This clear-headed Author has taken the pains to write ſomething about your Speech, wherein he all along makes thoſe Articles in the News-Paper to be expreſs parts of your Charge againſt *Exeter-College*, and upon that ſuppoſition enters into a Defence of your Charge, ſuch Defence as it is. Tho' unluckily enough he ſeems to have forgot himſelf

himſelf in one place, where the joining together the *Vice-Chancellor*'s Speech and the News-Paper, he calls, in his polite manner, *unparallelled Impudence* in the Defender of *Exeter-College*; whereas the Defender of the *Vice-Chancellor* has done the very ſame Thing throughout his whole Performance. You ſee then, Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, that both your Hearers and Defenders are Evidences againſt you: ſo that tho' one cannot perhaps ſay directly—*Tu Pater et rerum Inventor!*—Yet we ſhall all joyn in ſaying—*Tu ſanguinis ultimus auctor!*—for you are certainly the ultimate Author of this ill *Blood*.

Again *Thirdly*, the Paragraph in the News-Paper appear'd to contain not only ſuch matters as had been well recollected by the Complainants, but a farther Accuſation of which they were not ſo perfectly ſure. The Words are—*This led him* (the Vice-Chancellor) *to animadvert with a becoming zeal and ſeverity on the infamous Behaviour of one College, which—proſtituted itſelf during the whole Poll to be the ſhop of* CORRUPTION, *and the Factory of* PERJURY. Now this article is plainly produced not as an addition to the *Vice-Chancellor*'s Speech, but as repreſenting the Matter of it: And being firſt publiſhed in the *London-Evening Poſt* was from thence carefully tranſcribed into *Jackſon*'s Journal, publiſhed in *Oxford*.——Pray

Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, did you ever remonſtrate againſt this ſcandalous and abuſive Article? Did you think *Exeter-College* more vehemently aſperſed by this Article, than you intended it ſhould be by your Speech? Did you think your Speech miſrepreſented by an additional Clauſe of Calumny, which was not in the Original? Did you think yourſelf injur'd by being made the Author of more Defamation, than you would chooſe to juſtify? But did you ever call the Printer to account for taking this Liberty with you? Did you ever contradict this Article publickly? Did you move a finger towards diſcouraging or diſcountenancing the wicked Aſperſion, thus ſpreading over the Nation to the Diſgrace and intended Ruin of an innocent Society, till now at laſt you have thought yourſelf called upon to ſay ſomething in your Defence? So far from it, that pleaſing yourſelf with the Propagation of this moſt infamous Slander, propagated under the Authority of your own Name, propagated from an *Oxford* Preſs, before your Eyes, within your own Juriſdiction, yet have you diſclaim'd no part of your Intereſt in it till juſt now, but have permitted it to take its free Courſe, to be believed by as many of your Friends, and the Friends of your Cauſe, as were diſpoſed to believe it. What, in the name of common Senſe, is this, but to adopt the ſlanderous Imputation, and to make

make it your own, tho' you ſhould not have been the genuine and original Author of it? Obſerve, Sir, this Conſideration of itſelf precludes what you may pretend to plead from publiſhing ſo much of your Speech, as you judg'd proper, relative to your Accuſations of *Exeter-College*. Indeed in this Extract, the infamous Article, now inſiſted on, does not appear: but tho' it had never been in your Speech at all, yet you have now adopted it, and muſt maintain it, however chargeable it may prove to do ſo.

As to the Extracts of your Speech, you have now publiſhed, it might have been more ſatisfactory as well as more obliging, had you granted them at the time when they were requeſted of you. You ſay indeed, you have publiſhed all that was relative to *Exeter-College*, and that without any the minuteſt Variation from what was delivered in Convocation. Had you not declared ſo, it might have been ſuſpected that the whole which related to the College is not publiſhed, and that there were ſeveral Glances at it ſcatter'd about other parts of the Speech, of which nothing appears at preſent; it might have been ſuſpected, that you had ſome Reaſon for not publiſhing your Extracts till more than three Months after your Speech was delivered, in expectation

tation that the more minute Particulars of it might be forgotten by the Complainants. But this Matter you have clear'd up by aſſerting the Contrary, ſo no more muſt be ſaid.

But you have done enough, Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, as it is: There is no want of embittering Expreſſions to heighten your Charges againſt the College, other than are now before the Publick, in the Extracts you have given. Your *Scenam oculis pudicis adeo ingratam*; your affectionate wiſh that it could be permitted you *to paſs it by untouch'd*, or that you might *draw a Veil* over it, and hint at it only *Obſcurely*; but that your Duty to the Univerſity forbad you to conceal its *Diſgraces*, &c.—What can all this mean? What Idea muſt it give a Stranger unacquainted with the Affair? That *Scene ſo ſhocking to chaſte Beholders!* What Tranſactions muſt have paſſed within theſe impure Walls? What did you deſign the World ſhould think of *Exeter-College*, but as ſomething worſe, if poſſible, than a common Brothel? —Complain no more, Sir, of Inſinuations againſt yourſelf; after this, you have no right to make any ſuch Complaints, you that have inſinuated the darkeſt things againſt others, that have endeavoured to leave the blackeſt Impreſſions upon Mens minds, both from what

you have ſaid, and from what you have affected to leave unſaid.

The *next* Point on which you have thought proper to beſtow ſome particular notice, relates to a pretended Charge of Diſloyalty on yourſelf. Your own Words ſhall be produced: " There is one Aſper-
" ſion of a Nature more malvolent than
" the reſt, to the thorough Refutation of
" which all other Conſiderations muſt give
" way; that of Diſaffection to his Majeſty
" King *George*, for whoſe Perſon and Go-
" vernment he (the *Vice-Chancellor*) has ever
" entertained the moſt dutiful and affec-
" tionate Zeal. The ſame Inſinuation is
" artfully convey'd in their method of re-
" lating a particular Inſtance of his Con-
" duct, which will be found in Extract
" No. 2"—It ſhall ſoon appear, that you have as little Reaſon to ſupport this Article as the former. The Complaint is grounded on what the Defender has ſaid page 61, 62. of *the Defence*, and on his Relation of a certain Fact publiſhed in your Extract No. 2.

Let us ſee what can be made of it. The Words referr'd to, page 61. 62. are theſe:
" You ſhould not have dipp'd your Pen in
" Gall when you were compoſing your
" anniverſary Oration, in order to expoſe
" the College to publick Reproach.—In
" this

" this, Sir, you have been no Friend to " the Univerſity, or yourſelf. For, what " can this naturally tend to, but to con- " firm thoſe Suſpicions of Diſaffection, " which you would ſeem ſo anxious to re- " move? Such violent Outrage upon a " Body of Men, for ſhewing a zeal in " this Cauſe,—An over-zeal, let us for " once ſuppoſe it,—What elſe can it be " thought of abroad, but that in reality " you are as zealous in another Cauſe, " which you dare not own?" Now let it be aſk'd you, whether the Ground of this Expoſtulation be not ſupported by your own Conceſſions; nay, by your own expreſs acknowledgments? Have you not complain'd on the part of what you call this much injur'd Univerſity, that Suſpicions of its Diſloyalty have prevailed abroad, and that it *has been branded with Diſaffection?* And are you now angry, that the Defender only intimates, what you have expreſsly complain'd of? Would there were no ſuch Complaints, nor any Grounds for them! The Defender is as willing as you are to hope, that Diſloyalty is not the natural Growth of the Place, but only *imported* from abroad. But if you are aware that ſuch Importations have been made, and may every day be farther made, does it not become you to uſe your beſt Endea-

vours

vours to ſatisfy the World, that every thing of this kind is here diſcouraged? Now, pray Sir, have you done this? Have you not looked with a very evil Eye on thoſe who have expreſs'd a particular Zeal for the Government? Whence elſe comes it to paſs, that you have mark'd out *Exeter-College* for the Object of your Indignation? Had they done any thing to provoke this, or to deſerve it in the leaſt degree? And now, when you are only told, " That in " this you have been no Friend to the " Univerſity, nor to yourſelf: For what " can this naturally tend to, but to con- " firm thoſe Suſpicions of Diſaffection, " you would ſeem ſo anxious to remove;" You repreſent this as a Charge of Diſloyalty on yourſelf. Let the Reader of common Senſe, if he has common Candor too, judge. No Charge of Diſloyalty is here brought againſt you; 'tis a Charge of Folly or Indiſcretion, if you pleaſe, in ſo carrying Matters, as to confirm thoſe Suſpicions of Diſaffection entertain'd abroad, which you are anxious to remove. Having thus, Sir, invented a Charge againſt yourſelf, of which you would have the Defender be the Author; how triumphantly do you go on to abuſe him! " He " (the *Vice-Chancellor*) cannot but remark " on this Occaſion the diſingenuous Beha-

" viour of thoſe Men, who, attentive as
" they were to his Speech in Convoca-
" tion, have yet ventur'd to call in queſ-
" tion his Loyalty; of which not only the
" whole Tenor of his Conduct through
" Life, but many Paſſages of that Speech
" itſelf, might have furniſhed them with
" ample Demonſtration."

Sir, the Defender had nothing to do with the whole Tenor of your Conduct thro' Life, or indeed with any other Paſſages of your Speech, than what ſome way related to *Exeter-College*. He ſays, he has not queſtion'd your Loyalty; but if you have, by your Manner of acting, during your Vice-chancellorſhip, brought your own Loyalty into queſtion, the Defender is not anſwerable for this, tho' you yourſelf moſt certainly are. However, ſince you require a Teſtimonial of your Loyalty from the Defender of *Exeter-College*, (which by the way is more than you ought to expect, from a Pleader againſt you) you ſhall have it. Moſt excellently done then be it hereby pronounced! that you have publiſhed that Extract from your Speech, to which you now refer N° 4. This may have a double Effect, and tend as well to remove thoſe Suſpicions which Perſons abroad have been apt to entertain, as to let the young Importers of Diſloyalty know what they

they are to expect from you. These Words, relating to them, deserve to be written in large Letters of Gold,—*à fidissimâ matre Academiâ ablegentur, exulent. Domum reportent Perfidiam suam, non hic alendam, nec, simul ac innotuerit, tolerandam* —Go on, Sir, to execute what you have so gloriously threaten'd. The first treasonable Offender that falls into your Hands, let him take his Fate: And let others beware. The Prospects of the University will then —begin to brighten.

But whilst we are upon the Subject of Loyalty, one Thing, Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, 'tis hoped, you will be pretty cautious in for your own sake; which is, that you do not trust the Defence of that Part of your Character to the Hands of your Second, who, not having any Loyalty himself, and in that respect honest enough not to pretend to any, will make but an aukward Advocate for the Loyalty of others. But as the Liberty of the *Oxford*-Press has been now suspended for several Days, and the Doors of the Printing-House, by an unusual Act of Power, kept closely shut, 'tis expected some important Matters, some formidable Discoveries will soon issue forth; some Deeds of *Darkness*, no doubt, as the *Watch-plot-man* has promised us, will be *brought to Light*. Whatever of this sort be

done will be right: All Iniquity wherever, and in whomſoever detected, ſhould be expoſed to open Day, and laid to the Charge of thoſe to whom it properly belongs. But let not the Grand Libeller be ſuffer'd to libel the Univerſity from its own Preſs, by entring into a Defence of its Loyalty, which very Defence coming from HIM, will be a ſeverer Libel upon it, than any that have come from its bittereſt Enemies.

We proceed, Sir, to *another* Circumſtance you have called in to ſupport your Complaint. Thus you expreſs yourſelf; "The ſame Inſinuation (of Diſaffection) "is artfully convey'd in their Method of "relating a particular Inſtance of his (the "*Vice-Chancellor*'s,) Conduct, which will "be found, Extract Nº 2." There will be no Neceſſity at preſent of tranſcribing Paſſages at length, as you have publiſhed the Defender's Account and your own in Nº. 2, and 3.—Now, Sir, what one Thing is there in the Defender's Account, contradicted in your own? You have indeed ſuggeſted ſeveral Circumſtances not mentioned by the Defender, in moſt of which you have the Misfortune to miſreport. But without entring into a Diſpute concerning matters no way affecting the Point before us, let it be obſerv'd, that according to the Defender's own Account publiſh'd by yourſelf,

yourſelf, " The Rector expreſs'd himſelf " very well ſatisfied with the *Vice-Chancel-* " *lor*'s Sentence upon the young Man, to " beg pardon in the Convocation-Houſe, " imagining the Puniſhment was to be " Publick and Exemplary." Now, Sir, did you in any reaſonable way gratify this Expectation of the Rector? So far from it, that you contriv'd it ſhould be done in the moſt private manner, in an ordinary Congregation, at Ten in the Morning; the very next Morning, obſerve, after the Sentence had been pronounced. It may be ſeen from hence, that nothing of what you would appear to have determined was done, excepting to oblige the Offender to beg pardon in the Convocation-Houſe, that is, in the Room where the *Convocation* is held,—The ſame being the Room in which the *Congregation* is held likewiſe. But you would perſuade your Readers, by a moſt extraordinary Note, page 14; that " This " had better be done in the Congregation " than the Convocation, and that the form- " er was the more proper *Place* for inflict- " ing an Act of Diſcipline." By the more proper *Place*, you mean, with Submiſſion, the more proper *Aſſembly*; for the queſtion is not about the Place, but the Aſſembly, the ſame Room being the Place

of

of both. And that the Convocation is the more ſolemn, as well as, generally ſpeaking, the more numerous Aſſembly, is evident from your own Deſcription of each; the Convocation *being compoſed of all the Doctors and Maſters in the Univerſity*; the *Congregation* conſiſting *of all Doctors*, with ſuch only of the Maſters, as are ſtatutably qualified under certain Limitations. It is true, Congregations, on certain Occaſions, may be better attended than a Convocation, that is appointed to meet at a Morning-hour, and for ſome trifling matter. But would a *Vice-Chancellor*, who is in earneſt, appoint an Act of Diſcipline, of great Importance to the Univerſity, to be perform'd in ſuch a Convocation as this? Would he appoint it to be perform'd in an *ordinary* Congregation, in the middle of a Term, when few Maſters attend, excepting thoſe who are abſolutely obliged ſo to do? What numbers might have been preſent in the Congregation of *Feb.* 14, 1754, cannot perhaps be preciſely remembred at this diſtance of Time. You call it a *full* Congregation, which Expreſſion may ſound well abroad, for want of being well underſtood. It ſhould be known therefore, that a *full* Congregation requires no more than this, that the Perſons preſent be the *Vice-Chancellor*, the

two

two Proctors, and nine Regents, whether Doctors or Maſters, without which Number there can be no Congregation at all: So that a Congregation, and a *full* Congregation, expreſs one and the ſame thing. And how numerous this Aſſembly was of *Feb.* 14, as likewiſe of what ſort the two following Convocations were, will appear by conſulting the Univerſity Regiſter. There it will be found, that *Feb.* 14, 1754, a Congregation was held, when one Perſon took a Maſter's Degree, the reſt of the Buſineſs being only to paſs ſome common Diſpenſations. The two following Convocations were held in the Morning, the one *Feb.* 22, for paſſing three common Letters, the other *March* 29, when only one common Letter was read. And the Reading of this ſort of Letters in a Morning Convocation, 'tis well known in *Oxford*, is little better than reading to the Walls. And now, Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, *the groſs Prevarication*, which page 4. you have charged on *your nameleſs Adverſary*, you will pleaſe to take back again, and place it to your own Account, who have not ſcrupled to put your own NAME to it at full length.

But it will be aſk'd, if what the *Vice-Chancellor* did, on this Occaſion, be judged not proper, what would the Defender eſteem

eſteem to be ſo? To which he might anſwer, (as one who thought himſelf to have Senſe enough to ſee what was Right, without pretending to preſcribe to Authority) that ſome *ſolemn* Convocation ſhould have been called, if not for this Purpoſe ſingly, yet for ſome Purpoſe important. And if no notice were given by Papers ſent to common Rooms, that this Act of Diſcipline was to be perform'd in that Convocation, (which it would have been no improper thing to notify) yet ſuch time ſhould have paſſed between the Conviction of the Offender, and the Execution of the Sentence, as might afford Reaſon to ſuppoſe that the Matter to be tranſacted would be generally known. This would have drawn together Maſters enough; nor would there have been wanting a competent number of young Scholars attending at the Door of the Houſe, to ſee the Offender paſs in and out. This is all they had a Right to ſee, unleſs you, Sir, of your ſpecial Grace and Favour to the young Gentlemen, have admitted them *in domum Congregationis, necnon in alteram domum Convocationis.*

But it ſeems, " The Latin Form of Ac-
" knowledgment was enter'd, with the
" Offender's Name at length, among the
" Acts of Congregation, as a perpetual
" Teſtimony of his Crime and Puniſh-
" ment."

" ment." This may ſound great to thoſe who know nothing of the Univerſity; but to thoſe, who are acquainted with its Conſtitution, it is well known, that whatever is tranſacted in either Houſe of Convocation or Congregation *muſt*, by the Statutes, be regiſter'd. This is therefore no Addition to the young Man's Puniſhment, as the World are directed to believe, but included in the Sentence itſelf.

The Form itſelf you have likewiſe publiſhed. But pray, Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, is this Form in any degree ſufficient? Pleaſe to recollect, Sir, the Words proved to have been repeatedly utter'd by this Offender were, " KING JAMES FOR EVER". How ſtands the Form of Acknowledgment? " *Cum inflatus vino graviter peccavi,—Verba* " *in* PRINCIPEM *perfide effutiendo*, &c." What, Sir, is the KING of *Great-Britain* to be degraded, and allowed no Title but that of a mere PRINCE? This is not your Intention; for in the cloſe of the Form, you have term'd him *Regem noſtrum* GEORGIUM. The real Deſign ſeems to be this; that it might not appear hereafter how grievouſly the young Man had offended, but that it might look, as if he had only inſulted one of the Royal Family. Should this prove the Senſe in which Perſons abroad interpret the Form you have preſcribed, you muſt blame no one but your-

ſelf, who, by this ill-judged Publication, will have contributed much more to make your Loyalty ſuſpected, than any Thing ſaid, or ſuppoſed to be intimated by the Defender.

Does it not by this time appear, " in " how tender a Manner the *Vice-Chancellor* " has treated this Offender ?"—Inſtead of making this Acknowledgment a *publick* one, he has render'd it almoſt as much a *private* one as could be. He has regiſter'd indeed the Form of Acknowledgment, but this is done only amongſt the Acts of Congregation, no Entry being made in the *Black Regiſter*, the *Liber Nebulonum*, which yet is the proper Regiſter for Offenders, more eſpecially Criminals of the firſt Magnitude. And this very Form itſelf is drawn up in ſuch Terms, that within a Year or two, no Perſon who ſhall read it, will be able to gueſs what the Crime was, which the Criminal is ſuppos'd to acknowledge.

It is ſtill further to be noted, that this Lenity of Mr. Vice-Chancellor towards the Offender, is equally diſcernible, in his Manner of relating his Offence, in the Extract N°. 3. particularly as to his Youth and Drunkenneſs, which he repreſents as alleviating Circumſtances of his Guilt. Tho' ſurely no ſober Man will allow Drunkenneſs to be an Excuſe for Treaſon, unleſs he can ſuppoſe the Treaſon to be taken in with the

the Liquor. It is not uncommon indeed, when ſuch kind of Principles are already in a Man, for the Liquor to bring them out; but that it ſhould convey them in, was never before heard of.

One thing however, Sir, which you have farther alledged, muſt not be paſs'd over, *viz.* "That your Sentence with regard to "the young Man appear'd to be entirely "approved by the Rector;—and that no "Objection was made by him to the Form "or Time of the Submiſſion." That the Rector expreſſed himſelf very well ſatisfied with your Sentence, when declared, is acknowledg'd on all Sides. What was and is ſtill objected againſt, relates to the Manner of executing the Sentence. And with regard to the Time or Form of the Submiſſion, you yourſelf, Sir, took care to prevent all Objections being made to either, by ſending the young Man, not your Beadle or your Servant, but the young Man himſelf, (who would be ſure not to make too much haſte), juſt at the time when the Congregation was ready to ſit. The Rector indeed juſt caſt an haſty Eye over the Paper put into his hands, but threw it back in great Diſpleaſure, as thinking himſelf trifled with. And not only ſo, but, 'tis very well known, he complain'd of it, immediately after, amongſt his Friends and Ac-

quaintance, as well of other Colleges as his own; being really and ſincerely grieved at that time, .that what had been made to wear the Appearance of a ſolemn Act of Diſcipline, ſhould be turn'd into a ſolemn Farce.

As to the Circumſtance of the Offender's being ſuſpended from his Degree for one Term, the Rector does not remember its being mentioned in his hearing as Part of your Sentence; nor, if he had remember'd it, was it material to be mentioned by the Defender, as the Rector had expreſſed himſelf fully ſatisfied with the important Part of the Sentence, the publick Penance you had enjoin'd him, tho' this ſhould not have been added, which is but a trivial Circumſtance at moſt, and ſuch as may chance to carry with it neither Diſgrace nor Inconvenience. —— The Taſk impoſed on him by his College-Governor was HIS Act of Diſcipline, Sir, and not YOURS: But how you came to aſſert that the young Man had perform'd that Exerciſe, belongs not to this Place to enquire.

As you have taken no notice of the many other Particulars mentioned in the *Defence*, not even of the Grievance complain'd of, in your refuſing Redreſs againſt your own Common-Room Man, for his Inſult upon *Exeter-College* and the two Gentlemen Candidates

didates of the *New-Intereſt*, this Silence, 'tis preſumed, muſt be interpreted as proceeding from *your great Senſibility of your Station*; as muſt likewiſe your final Declaration,—" That you will not be provoked to " trouble yourſelf or the Publick with a " further Anſwer." The Trouble you have already had, Sir, has been of your own creating. For had you not thought fit to attack a whole Society in a moſt unprecedented manner, not only yourſelf, but the Defender, would have been ſaved the Trouble of what you are now pleaſed to call, an ATTACK upon yourſelf. In ſhort, had you not been too violently (for a Magiſtrate at leaſt) attach'd to a Party, you would have thought it more adviſeable, (to uſe the Words of the Defender, *page* 62.) " To have taken the moderate Part " at leaſt, and have ſpared your Cenſures " upon the little Appearances of Unacade- " micalneſs in the College, conſidering the " Exigency of the Caſe, the laudable Mo- " tives they acted from, the Juſtice they " thought due to the Intereſts of the Cauſe " they eſpouſed, and their Humanity in " giving Shelter and Aſſiſtance to the ho- " neſt Freeholders." Common Candor and Good-nature, which you do not want upon other Occaſions, or the World is greatly miſtaken in their Opinion of you, would have induced you to make this Allowance; nay,

nay, it might have been demanded of you in ſtrict Juſtice. But Party-rage, what will it not do? It will ſpoil the beſt of Tempers, and carry Men to ſtrange Outrages in ſupport of their Cauſe,—*per fas aut nefas*, juſt as it may happen. For you can ſcarce ſay, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, however your Loyalty may ſtand unimpeached, that you are entirely free from this Party-rage, ſince the execrable Epithets you have pour'd out upon the New Intereſt Freeholders, without any Provocation, will be a glaring and ſtanding Evidence againſt you upon Record. *Profanum, famelicum, monſtrum horrendum*, &c. &c. To attempt a Tranſlation of this Paſſage, would be an Injury to the Original. Nay, as angry Men are ſubject to contradict themſelves, theſe very hunger-ſtarved Monſters are deſcribed by you, almoſt in the ſame Breath, as rioting in the Exceſſes of Gluttony and Drunkenneſs, *fœdiſſimo Ingluviei & Ebrietatis exceſſu*, &c.

It has indeed been ſurmiſed, but ſurely without foundation, that poſſibly the Vice-Chancellor's chief View in falling upon *Exeter-College* might have been deeper laid, than to ſhort-ſighted Men may appear. For what if it might be pleaded in the Houſe of Commons, that the Proceedings of the New-Intereſt Gentlemen and

their Friends had been ſo ſhameful and ſcandalous, that the Vice-Chancellor of *Oxford* himſelf, in a ſolemn Oration before the Univerſity, had thought it his Duty to paſs a public Cenſure upon *Exeter-College*, for the infamous Share they had in theſe Proceedings? But ſurely ſuch a Surmiſe muſt be without Foundation; for you could not think ſo unworthily of that Honourable Houſe, as to ſuppoſe them capable of being influenced by any thing to be ſaid by you or me, or by any other Motive than that of Juſtice to the Cauſe itſelf.

Sir, you ſay you will write no more. Suffer yourſelf, therefore, to be taken leave of in the way you took leave of *Exeter-College* in your *Latin* Speech, that is, with an Admonition; *ut, futuris temporibus, ſi quid ejuſmodi ſeſe obtulerit*, you will be more cautious and prudent than to interpoſe either your Cenſure or Reprimand where you have no Concern: and that you will remember the wiſe Proverb of the wiſeſt of Men, *He that paſſeth by and meddleth with ſtrife* BELONGING NOT TO HIM, *is like one that taketh a Dog by the Ears.*—However, if any thing farther upon this Subject ſhould appear hereafter, worthy of notice, tho' not under your own Hand, yet will it be conſidered as under your Direction; and the Anſwer to it ſhall be addreſſed to yourſelf, and to yourſelf only.

only. For, *I fight neither with ſmall nor great, ſave only with* Ahab *King of* Iſrael.

AFTER this Addreſs to the Vice-Chancellor, it will be neceſſary to make one Reflection, to which the Reader is earneſtly requeſted to attend.

It has been objected to the Author or Authors, take which you pleaſe, of the *Defence of Exeter-College*, that the Vice-Chancellor has been treated in it with too little Ceremony; not only ſo, but with ſome degree of Acrimony, and in a manner unbecoming the Reſpect due to his Office; and that ſuch irreverent Behaviour muſt tend to the Hurt of the Univerſity, by diſcrediting the Dignity of its chief Magiſtrate. The Writer is not conſcious of any the leaſt Reflection upon the Univerſity, even the moſt diſtant.—But, as to the Vice-Chancellor, the Makers of this Objection are deſired to aſk themſelves a few ſerious Queſtions, *viz:* Whether they think the Univerſity, and the Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity, to be one and the ſame thing? If not, whether they really think the Credit of one Man, though a Vice-Chancellor, of more Conſequence to the Public or to the Univerſity, than that of a whole College? Whether the World abroad, or the World at home, be not at leaſt as much intereſted in the Reputation and Character of an anti-

ent

ent and conſiderable Houſe of Education, as in that of a ſingle Magiſtrate, of one Year's Continuance? Whether is the more venerable and reſpectable Name in itſelf, that of a long incorporated, uſeful, and flouriſhing Foundation, or that of a ſingle Gentleman in Office, how irreproachable ſoever in his private Life, or how worſhipful ſoever by his public Station?—Let them aſk themſelves one Queſtion more, whether they would be content to be ſo dealt with themſelves, to be vilified and aſperſed, accuſed, condemned, and executed without mercy, only for being ſo unfortunate, to take the wrong Side at a County-Election? Others, in more ſober Semblance, lament that, after all, to reproach the chief Magiſtrate of the Univerſity, the Vice-Chancellor himſelf, and to charge him ſo heavily, muſt certainly be wrong, ill-judged, ill-timed, unſeaſonable, better let alone, and ſo forth. One need be endowed with an uncommon ſhare of Patience to hear Men talk in this manner. For the plain Engliſh of it is no other than this, that poor *Exeter-College* was to be fairly run down, like a hunted Hare, without offering at any Reſiſtance, never more to ſhew its Face, or lift up its diminiſhed Head.—This may be Sport to you, Gentlemen, but it is Death to us. But whilſt Self-Defence is as allowable in one Man, or in one Body of Men,

as in another; ſo long as there is a Pen left in *Exeter-College*, *Nemo me impunè laceſſet* ſhall be its Motto. It ſhall be drawn upon every Occaſion, where the good Fame of that Society is ſtruck at undeſervedly.——'Tis not meant by this that every idle Scribler, *(a)* or common Defamer, *(a)* is to have the Honour

(*a*) The Writer of a Pamphlet newly publiſhed, called *a Letter to the Author of the Defence of* Exeter-College, with Interſperſions of Notes and ſerious Advice, *&c.*, will not take it amiſs, 'tis hoped, that he is ranked, for the preſent, under one or other of theſe Denominations, (let him take his choice,) as his Performance is really but a ſcolding Piece; and if the Reader ſhould happen to ſuſpect there is any thing of Argument in it, he will find it fully obviated in the foregoing Addreſs. But as there is a material Fact or two roundly aſſerted and vehemently maintained, it may be proper juſt to point them out to the Notice of the Reader.—— He affirms and repeats it again and again, as an undeniable Fact, that there could be no Danger of Inſults from the Scholars, becauſe they were *cloſely confined for the three firſt Days of the Poll*, ſee p. 37. and p. 60. He aſks, *Were not the Scholars cloſely confined for three Days at leaſt?*—No, not one Day. So far from it, that they were let out more or leſs, every Day of the Poll; particularly the 2d and 3d Days, great Numbers came from other Colleges into *Exeter*, many of whom, for their inſolent Behaviour, were deſired to walk out again.——The Writer, if he were at *Oxford* at the time of the Poll, (as he ſeems to intimate ſomewhere elſe in his Letter) KNOWS what he has aſſerted to be abſolutely void of Truth.

Another well known Fact, known of all Sides, and *ſolemnly* acknowledged by ſome of his own Side, is, that

nour of a formal Anſwer vouchſafed him, whenever the ſcribling Fit comes upon him, or he wants to diſcharge his Venom upon *Exeter-College*. 'Tis to be hoped, the Gentlemen of that Society know better how to employ their Time. Your *Scamnum*-Writers and *Penny-leſs-Bench* Authors, with the reſt of that Claſs, are deſpiſed; not but a Stricture now and then upon their dirty Characters may not be amiſs, if it be only to let them ſee how *much* they are deſpiſed. But when Perſons of Character, more eſpecially Magiſtrates, ſtoop ſo low as

the Paſſages to the Front of the Booths were all along occupied and poſſeſſed by the Old Intereſt Mob, ſo as to make it extremely difficult, if not totally impracticable, for the New Intereſt Voters to get through that way: and yet this Man makes no ſcruple to declare the contrary, in the Face of the whole World.——This Poſition therefore of his he likewiſe KNOWS to be, in his own Words, *the groſſeſt Falſhood and the groſſeſt Impoſition that ever was put upon Mankind.*——But of this and his *Table of Facts*, (he means, *Fictions*) p. 29, the World will have full Satisfaction, from the Evidence that has already appeared, and will ſtill farther appear, before that auguſt Aſſembly, who have now under minute Examination the Facts, and Circumſtances, and Merits of the conteſted Cauſe.—However, if this Writer (as he ſeems deſirous of being conſidered) ſhould take it in his head to put out another Pamphlet upon the Subject, and will give us a little better Logic, and a little better Engliſh, he may deſerve a more reſpectful Conſideration. In the mean while, let him enjoy the ſatisfaction of his preſent Lucubrations, unenvied and unmoleſted.

to

to rake into the Kennels of theſe Creatures, and to defile their Mouths with their filthy Language, this muſt be expected to be reſented with a juſt and laſting Indignation. Otherwiſe, where much Dirt is thrown, ſome will be apt to ſtick.

POSTSCRIPT.

The foregoing Addreſs to the Vice-Chancellor would have appeared ſooner, but that it was judged proper to wait a little for Dr. *K—g*'s Productions, with which the *Oxford* Preſs was ſweating at the time theſe Sheets were in hand. It was ſuſpended a ſecond time in expectation of other Matters threatned from other Quarters, in order that if any thing either from him or them ſhould be found worth Notice, relating to the Diſpute betwixt the Vice-Chancellor and *Exeter-College*, proper Animadverſions might be made upon it. One of theſe Performers has his Anſwer in the foregoing Note. The other Piece has been publiſhed under the Title of *Doctor King*'s *Apology*, or, *Vindication of himſelf*, &c; tho' it had been more properly entitled, his *Panegyric upon himſelf*, as it contains little more than his uſual Abuſes upon others and Encomiums

ums upon himſelf, his own excellent Endowments and eſtabliſhed Reputation, his underſtanding *Latin*, his Patriotiſm, his Patrimony, his Family, his Importance to himſelf and the Public, *&c.*— Beſides this, and his Apprehenſions of being aſſaſſinated by his Adverſaries, there is nothing material, worth remarking, to trouble the Reader with. At leaſt there is nothing material, with which the Defender of *Exeter-College* has any Concern, any more than he is concerned to determine the other important Article, whether the Apologiſt be an IRISHMAN or an ENGLISHMAN.

F I N I S.